



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,151	02/14/2002	Mark Delaney	176/1	6936

27538 7590 08/03/2004
KAPLAN & GILMAN, L.L.P.
900 ROUTE 9 NORTH
WOODBIDGE, NJ 07095

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/075,151

Applicant(s)

DELANEY ET AL.

Examiner

Md S Elahee

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 19-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 19-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 2645

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed 05/28/04. Claims 1-15 and 19-29 are pending. Claims 16-18 and 30-36 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 and 19-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the added limitation at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 12, 19, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding claim 1, the phrase 'a memory for storing a category of telephone numbers', on page 2, line 3 of the claim, is not disclosed in the original specification.

Regarding claim 1, the word 'optimal', on page 2, lines 7 and 9 of the claim, is not disclosed in the original specification. Claims 7, 10, 12, 19, 25 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claim 2, the limitation 'said memory.....said data network', on page 2, lines 13-15 of the claim, is not disclosed in the original specification.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said optimal originating gateways" on page 2, line 9 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Joseph et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0123436).

Regarding claim 1, Joseph teaches a database (i.e., memory) for storing Call Detail Records (CDR's) (i.e., a category of telephone numbers) representing telephone calls to be placed over an internet network (i.e., data network) in packet switched format (fig.3; page 3, paragraphs 0046-0048, page 4, paragraph 0052).

Art Unit: 2645

Joseph further teaches front end switch (i.e., processing means) for accepting a dialed telephone call directly from a device initiating the call, for determining, prior to the call reaching a telephone switch, whether the call is within the category, and for routing the call through an originating gateway (i.e., optimal originating gateway) to the data network if so (fig.3, 14; page 4, paragraph 0052, page 9, paragraphs 0115, 0116).

Joseph further teaches routing controller (i.e., selecting means) for determining the originating gateway (i.e., optimal originating gateway) from plural originating gateways each being capable of conveying the call to the data network (fig.14; page 9, paragraphs 0115- 0117, page 10, paragraphs 0124-0126).

Regarding claim 2, Joseph teaches that the database (i.e., memory) stores information concerning which of the plural originating gateways to utilize to access the data network (fig.3; page 3, paragraphs 0046-0048, page 4, paragraph 0052).

Regarding claim 3, Joseph teaches that each of the originating gateways is capable of communicating over a data network to plural terminating gateways (fig.4, 14; page 4, paragraphs 0057-0059, 0061, page 4, paragraph 0052, page 9, paragraphs 0115-0117, page 10, paragraphs 0124-0126).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2645

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joseph et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0123436) and in view of Crowe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,460).

Regarding claim 4, Joseph fails to teach "said category is comprised of calls outside of an area code in which the call originates". Crowe teaches that the category is comprised of data calls in which the call originates (fig.2; col.7, lines 9-16, col.8, lines 25-29; 'data calls' reads on the claim 'calls outside of an area code'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Joseph to allow the category being comprised of calls outside of an area code in which the call originates as taught by Crowe. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to keep the long distance call record.

11. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joseph et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0123436) and in view of Girard (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0176404).

Regarding claim 5, Joseph fails to teach "said operations center being capable of altering information stored within said memory and implementing changes to said category of telephone numbers". Girard teaches the operations center being capable of modifying information stored within the database and implementing changes to the category of telephone numbers (abstract; page 8, paragraph 0097, page 16, paragraph 0208; 'modifying' reads on the claim 'altering' and 'database' reads on the claim 'memory'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Joseph to allow operations center being capable of altering information stored within said memory and implementing changes to said

Art Unit: 2645

category of telephone numbers as taught by Girard. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to generate the updated information.

12. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joseph et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0123436) and in view of Crowe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,460) and further in view of Girard (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0176404).

Regarding claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 5.

13. Claims 7-11, 19, 24, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neyman (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,783) and in view of Joseph et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0123436).

Regarding claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Neyman teaches receiving the call directly from a PSTN caller (i.e., device) initiating the call and examining, prior to the call reaching a Trunk gateway (i.e., telephone switch), a received telephone number to ascertain whether a particular property is present (col.8, lines 66, 67, col.9, lines 1-6).

Neyman further teaches that if so, routing the call to a Data gateway, and if not, routing the call to a Trunk gateway (col.9, lines 1-6; 'Data gateway' reads on the claim 'optimal originating gateway' and 'Trunk gateway' reads on the claim 'telephone switch').

However, Neyman fails to teach "if the call is routed to the optimal originating gateway, examining the telephone number again to determine to which of a plurality of terminating gateways the call should be routed". Joseph teaches that if the call is routed to the optimal originating gateway, examining the telephone number again to determine

Art Unit: 2645

to which of a plurality of destination (i.e., terminating) gateways the call should be routed (fig.2, 4, 14; page 4, paragraphs 0057-0059, 0061, page 9, paragraphs 0115- 0117, page 10, paragraphs 0124-0126). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman to allow examining the telephone number again to determine to which of a plurality of terminating gateways the call should be routed as taught by Joseph. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the proper utilization of the resources.

Regarding claim 8, Neyman fails to teach “said originating gateway makes said determination of said terminating gateway in conjunction with other gateways”. Joseph teaches that the originating gateway makes said determination of said terminating gateway in conjunction with other gateways (fig.2, 4, 14; page 4, paragraphs 0057-0059, 0061, page 9, paragraphs 0115- 0117, page 10, paragraphs 0124-0126). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman to allow the originating gateway making the determination of said terminating gateway in conjunction with other gateways as taught by Joseph. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the proper utilization of the resources.

Regarding claim 9, Neyman fails to teach “reallocating traffic among plural terminating gateways”. Joseph teaches reallocating traffic among plural terminating gateways (fig.2, 4, 14; page 4, paragraphs 0057-0059, 0061). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman to reallocate traffic among plural terminating gateways as taught by Joseph. The

Art Unit: 2645

motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide alternate route for the traffic in case of failure of the one terminating gateway.

Regarding claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Neyman teaches receiving the call directly from a PSTN caller (i.e., device) initiating the call and examining a dialed number associated with a call prior to the call reaching a Trunk gateway (col.8, lines 66, 67, col.9, lines 1-6; 'Trunk gateway' reads on the claim 'telephone switch').

Neyman further teaches that if the number is within a pre-defined criteria, conveying the telephone call to a first remotely located Trunk gateway over a data network (col.9, lines 1-6; 'pre-defined criteria' reads on the claim 'predetermined class of numbers' and 'Trunk gateway' reads on the claim 'telephone switch').

Neyman further teaches that if the number is not within the pre-defined criteria, conveying the telephone call to a second remotely located Trunk gateway over a telephone network (col.9, lines 1-6; 'pre-defined criteria' reads on the claim 'predetermined class of numbers' and 'Trunk gateway' reads on the claim 'telephone switch').

Regarding claim 11, Neyman teaches that the remote Trunk gateway is reached via a Trunk gateway, and wherein the determination of which of the Trunk gateway is utilized to reach the remote Trunk gateway is made at least in part by comparing a predetermined subset of digits contained in a called telephone number (col.8, lines 61-67, col.9, lines 1-6; 'Trunk gateway' reads on the claim 'either a telephone switch, a first terminating gateway, or a second terminating gateway')

Regarding claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Neyman teaches receiving a dialed number associated with the call and examining the dialed number prior to the call reaching a Trunk gateway (i.e., telephone switch) by an IP router directly connected to a PSTN caller (i.e., device) initiating the call (col.8, lines 38- 51; 'IP router' reads on the claim 'router').

Neyman further teaches parking the dialed number at the IP router (col.8, lines 38- 51; 'IP router' reads on the claim 'router').

Neyman further teaches transmitting the dialed number from the router to an the selected optimal originating gateway (e.g. either Data gateway or Trunk gateway) (col.9, lines 1-6).

Neyman further teaches parking the dialed number at the originating gateway (e.g. either Data gateway or Trunk gateway) (col.9, lines 1-6).

However, Neyman fails to teach "sending the dialed number from the first gateway to a second gateway over said data network". Joseph teaches sending the call request (i.e., dialed number) from the first gateway to a second gateway over the data network (fig. 14; page 10, paragraphs 0124-0126). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman to send the dialed number from the first gateway to a second gateway over the data network as taught by Joseph. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to find out the best route to complete a call.

Neyman further fails to teach "connecting the call to a terminal identified by the dialed number". Joseph teaches completing (i.e., connecting) the call to a telephone 145 (i.e., terminal) identified by the dialed number (fig.14; page 10, paragraph 0126). Thus, it

Art Unit: 2645

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman to connecting the call to a terminal identified by the dialed number as taught by Joseph. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to redirect the call to the proper destination.

Regarding claims 24 and 27, Neyman fails to teach "locating an optimum terminating gateway". Joseph teaches locating an optimum terminating gateway (fig.2, 4, 14; page 4, paragraphs 0057-0059, 0061). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman to locate an optimum terminating gateway as taught by Joseph. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to handle a high volume of traffic.

Regarding claim 25 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 19. Furthermore, Neyman fails to teach "determining if the caller is authorized". Joseph teaches determining if the caller is authorized (page 4, paragraph 0055). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman to determine if the caller is authorized as taught by Joseph. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Neyman further teaches sending the dialed number from the router to a first gateway (e.g. either Data gateway or Trunk gateway) (col.9, lines 1-6).

14. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joseph et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0123436) and in view of Gordon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,905,273).

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Joseph teaches the routing controller (i.e., router) being programmed to examine routing requests (i.e., dialed numbers) associated with calls prior to the calls reaching a PSTN (fig.2, 14; page 4, paragraphs 0057-0059, page 9, paragraphs 0115- 0117).

It is not clear whether Joseph teaches a router connected directly to a device initiating the calls. Gordon teaches a process intermediary (i.e., router) connected directly to a transmitter (i.e., device) initiating the calls (abstract; fig.1; col.2, line 35-col.3, line17, col.3, lines 32-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Joseph to allow a router connected directly to a device initiating the calls as taught by Gordon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to receive call directly from the telephony device.

Joseph further fails to teach “the router further being programmed to separate long distance calls from local calls, the router further being programmed to transmit some of the long distance calls and all of the local calls over a circuit switching network, and the remainder of the long distance calls over a packet switching network”. Gordon teaches the process intermediary further being programmed to separate long distance calls from local calls, the process intermediary further being programmed to transmit some of the long distance calls and all of the local calls over a circuit switching network, and the remainder of the long distance calls over a data network (i.e., packet switching network) (abstract; fig.1; col.2, line 35-col.3, line17, col.3, lines 32-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Art Unit: 2645

Joseph to allow the router further being programmed to separate long distance calls from local calls, the router further being programmed to transmit some of the long distance calls and all of the local calls over a circuit switching network, and the remainder of the long distance calls over a packet switching network as taught by Gordon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to generate packets over the data network.

Regarding claim 13, Joseph teaches the selected optimal originating gateway is in communication with the routing controller (i.e., router) for converting the specific call from a analog (i.e., circuit switched) calls to a packet switched calls, and for routing same over a data network (abstract; fig.2, 4, 14; page 2, paragraphs 0038-0040, page 4, paragraphs 0057-0059, page 9, paragraphs 0115- 0117).

Regarding claim 14, Joseph teaches a terminating gateway to convert telephone calls from a packet switching format on the data network to a analog (i.e., circuit switching) format, and to place the calls in analog format on the telephone network (abstract; fig.2; page 1, paragraph 0008, page 2, paragraphs 0038-0040).

15. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joseph et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0123436) and in view of Gordon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,905,273) and further in view of Smith (U.S. Pub No. 2003/0123632).

Regarding claim 15, Joseph in view of Gordon fails to teach "each of said terminating gateways incurs a charge as a result of terminating said calls, and wherein changes in such charges are utilized to update routing information stored in said router". Smith teaches that each of the terminating gateways incurs a charge as a result of terminating the calls, and wherein changes in such charges are utilized to update routing

Art Unit: 2645

information stored in the router (page 3, paragraphs 0025). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Joseph in view of Gordon to allow each of the terminating gateways incurs a charge as a result of terminating said calls, and wherein changes in such charges are utilized to update routing information stored in the router as taught by Smith. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the proper charges for the telephone calls.

16. Claims 20-23, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neyman (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,783) and in view of Joseph et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0123436) and further in view of Galvin (U.S. Patent No. 6,134, 315).

Regarding claim 20, Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach "acquiring the caller's number and determining if the caller is authorized". Galvin teaches acquiring the caller's number and determining if the caller is authorized (abstract; col.4, lines 10-22, 42-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to determine if the caller is authorized as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Regarding claim 21, Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach "transmitting the calling number from the router to a computer". Galvin teaches transmitting the calling number from the router to a processor (abstract; col.4, lines 10-53; 'processor' reads on the claim 'computer'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to transmit the

Art Unit: 2645

calling number from the router to a computer as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to match the identity of the user.

Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach “accessing a database associated with the computer”. Galvin teaches accessing a database associated with the processor (abstract; col.4, lines 10-53; ‘processor’ reads on the claim ‘computer’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to accessing a database associated with the computer as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach “comparing a calling number to information stored in the database”. Galvin teaches comparing a calling number to information stored in the database (abstract; col.4, lines 10-53). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to compare a calling number to information stored in the database as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Regarding claim 22, Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach “sending an authorization to the router if the caller is authorized”. Galvin teaches sending an authorization to the router if the caller is authorized (abstract; fig.2; col.4, lines 10-53). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to send an authorization to the router if the caller is authorized as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Regarding claim 23, Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach “terminating the call if the caller is not authorized”. Galvin teaches terminating the call if the caller is not authorized (fig.2; col.8, lines 42-44). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to terminate the call if the caller is not authorized as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Regarding claim 26, Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach “acquiring the calling number by the router and transmitting the calling number from the router to a computer”. Galvin teaches acquiring the calling number by the router and transmitting the calling number from the router to a computer (abstract; col.4, lines 10-53; ‘processor’ reads on the claim ‘computer’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to acquire the calling number by the router and transmitting the calling number from the router to a computer as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to match the identity of the user and to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Regarding claim 28, Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach “sending an authorization to the router if the caller is authorized”. Galvin teaches sending an authorization to the router if the caller is authorized (abstract; col.4, lines 10-22, 42-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to send an authorization to the

Art Unit: 2645

router if the caller is authorized as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Regarding claim 29, Neyman in view of Joseph fails to teach "terminating the call if the caller is not authorized". Galvin teaches terminating the call if the caller is not authorized (fig.2; col.8, lines 42-44). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Neyman in view of Joseph to terminate the call if the caller is not authorized as taught by Galvin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make sure the authorized person is using the network.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chen (US Patent No. 6,463,053) teach Voice-and-fax-over IP dialing plan.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2645

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
July 24, 2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

